GREGORY SCHOPEN

COUNTING THE BUDDHA AND THE LOCAL SPIRITS IN: A MONASTIC RITUAL OF INCLUSION FOR THE RAIN RETREAT

– In Memory of Nalinaksha Dutt –

Neither time nor the vagaries of transmission have been kind to the Sanskrit text of the *Varṣāvastu* that we have. Its modern handlers too have not always treated it well. The Sanskrit text that we have of "The Chapter on the Rains" forms a part of the incomplete manuscript of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayavastu* from Gilgit, and that in itself means that for the Sanskrit text of this *Vastu* we have only a single, relatively late, exemplar – that is a problem. This single, relatively late, exemplar is, moreover, not a careful or always correct copy. There are numerous miswritings and more than one place where all other evidence strongly indicates that words, or even whole sentences, have dropped out of the Gilgit manuscript. This too is a problem, as is the fact that the manuscript for this *Vastu* itself is not complete.[1] Although a misreading of the original folio numbers made while compiling the facsimile initially concealed this,[2] an entire folio containing the very end of the *Pravāraṇāvastu* and a good deal of the beginning section of the *Varṣāvastu* has been lost or not yet identified. The right hand side of the first extant folio containing the *Varṣāvastu* has also been broken off and lost, meaning that from ten to twenty syllables have been lost from the first twenty lines of the text that we have; the final folio is also fragmentary. But the problems here have been even further compounded by the fact that Nalinaksha Dutt – the first to edit the manuscript – tried to make up for the losses by reconstructing the missing portions on the basis, ostensibly, of their Tibetan translation, and Professor Vogel has already shown, in specific regard to the text of the *Varṣāvastu*, how unhappy the results of such "reconstructions" are.[3]

Problems of this sort are sometimes, and perhaps more often than not, treated as if they were purely philological, or *just* textual problems, and it is therefore perhaps necessary to periodically remind ourselves and others that these are in fact historical and doctrinal problems of the first order, and that any or all fruitful attempts by historians or students of religion to understand something like, for example, Indian Buddhist monasticism are dependent on their successful solution. One

Journal of Indian Philosophy **30:** 359–388, 2002.

particularly striking illustration of this that occurs in the *Varṣāvastu* will be at issue here.

The first part of the *Varṣāvastu* lays out the procedures and ritual forms which are to be used by any group of Mūlasarvāstivādin monks who wish to enter into the rainy season retreat at any given locality or *āvāsa*. Not surprisingly, one of the first procedures concerns and determines membership in the group or – most simply put – who is in and who is out. Somewhat more surprising, perhaps, is the fact that membership in the group is not explicitly determined by acceptance of a specific monastic code, or even the *Vinaya*, but by the acceptance of what are technically known as *kriyākāras*, or – to use a gloss – "local monastic ordinances." Such local monastic ordinances – although not infrequently mentioned in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,[4] and although we have, for example, a part of one in Gāndhārī Prakrit from 3rd century Niya[5] – have not yet been thoroughly studied. It is, however, already clear that they were concerned with a very wide range of activities. One, for example, barred nuns from entering the local *vihāra*;[6] another made it an infraction for one who used the privy not to leave the equivalent of sufficient toilet paper for the next guy.[7] The specific content of such ordinances is not so important here as the fact that they were local, and that the acceptance of them was required to be counted as a member of the group that was undertaking the rain retreat in that specific location. And the individuals who accepted them were quite literally counted.

Buddhist monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* were required to count a number of things. They were, for example, required to count and keep track of the days of the lunar 'fortnight';[8] they were also required to count the number of monks in their community, initially, according to the text, so they could inform their hosts when invited to lunch.[9] Unfortunately – again according to the texts – these requirements collided with the narrative fact that the Buddhist monks that this monastic code envisioned were either not very attentive or had no head for numbers, and could not remember things from one day to the next. Faced with this dilemma the Buddha himself is said to have ordered that the monks must use certain mechanical devices – strips of bamboo strung on a string as a primitive calendar – and the far better known "counting" or "tally sticks," or *śalākās*.[10] How such counting sticks were used is in fact clear from the description of the procedure in the *Varṣāvastu* itself.

The first part of the description of the use of the counting sticks is fully preserved in our Gilgit exemplar. In it the importance of the local ordinances can be immediately seen, and what taking such a

counting stick means in this specific context is also unusually clear. The manuscript says:

tata(ḥ) paścāt kriyākāra ārocayitavyaḥ [/] śṛṇotu bhadantās saṃghaḥ asminn āvāse ayaṃ cāyaṃ ca kriyākāraḥ [/] yo yuṣmākam utsahate anena cānena ca kr[i]yākāreṇa varṣā upagantuṃ sa śalākāṃ gṛhṇātu . . .[11]

And here there are no significant textual problems. It need only be noted that in his edition Dutt has printed *ārādhayitavyaḥ* for what must be *ārocayitavyaḥ (brjod par bya ste)*,[12] and that the Tibetan formally marks its equivalent of *kriyākāra* as plural: *khrims su bca' ba dag*.[13] A translation would seem to be straightforward:

After that the local ordinance(s) must be announced: "Reverend Ones, the Community must hear! In this place of residence the local ordinance is this and this. Who among you is willing to undertake the rain retreat with this and this local ordinance must take a counting stick! . . ."

The first thing to be noted here is, of course, that what is given in this piece of legislation is a generic formulary designed for adaptation to specific local situations. The "this and this" would be replaced in any given case with the actual local ordinances of each specific *āvāsa*. But here again it is also important to note that membership in the group or local monastic community was determined not by the acceptance of, or willingness to adhere to, a specific *Vinaya* or monastic rule, but by the acceptance of, or willingness to adhere to, these specific local ordinances – only those who are so willing must take a stick, and, importantly, taking a counting stick signals both the willingness to accept such local ordinances and full membership in the local monastic community with any and all of its attendant privileges.

Although, again, a full discussion will have to wait, it is probably safe to say that a Western medievalist might see here at least a strong hint of something that he or she was familiar with. She or he would very likely agree that in the medieval Christian West monasteries were governed by a series of hierarchically ordered 'texts.' Although different scholars have used different labels for their groupings, most accept three layers of such texts:[14] the Rule proper – after a certain period most commonly Benedict's – "gives the spirit and the grand principles"; the Customaries, which clarify and complete the Rule, above all in regard to the liturgy and material organization of the Community; and the Statutes which "do not fix *a posteriori* the usages of the religious life that are already established. Quite the contrary – they continually enact the new or revise the old." Or again: "the Statutes do not present the principles of the communal life . . . like the Rule. They remain, on the

contrary, always very concrete and practical, and they fix up to the smallest detail that which must, in the future, be followed."

Our medievalist, almost certainly familiar with some version of this scheme, might very well not see exact correspondences, but would almost certainly see in our passage what Buddhist scholars have rarely noticed: a scheme of hierarchically arranged or layered rules. Our medievalist might also immediately assume what in Buddhist Studies has hardly ever been entertained, especially in regard to India: that actual local Buddhist monastic communities were much more directly ruled by local ordinances – our *kriyākāras* – than they ever were by canonical *Vinayas*. Our medievalist, moreover, may be right. Certainly there is good evidence of this for medieval Sri Lanka where we have a number of actual examples of *kriyākāras* – there called *vihāra katikāvatas* – preserved in inscriptions;[15] there is also good evidence for Tibet, to cite another example, as some recent work on Tibetan *Bca' yigs* has begun to make clear.[16] But there is also Indian evidence in need of close attention first of all. It is clear, for example, that *kriyākāras* were a fact to be reckoned with for Asaṅga, or whoever wrote the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, some time before the 4th/5th century. They are repeatedly referred to in its *Śīlapaṭala* where, unlike the rules of the canonical *Prātimokṣa*, they repeatedly constrain the implementation of some of the more extravagant Mahāyāna ideals.[17] Moreover, it is not only in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that one finds references to *kriyākāras*; they are also found in the Pāli *Vinaya*, called there *katikās*.[18] In fact it is already possible to suggest that such *kriyākāras* or *katikās* may well have been a part of Buddhist monastic 'legislation' from its beginning. But there – for now – the matter must rest, and we must pick up the counting sticks.

The distribution of the counting sticks begins – as we have seen – with the declaration that a stick must be taken only by those who are willing to undertake the retreat *with* the local ordinance, and the text here is well preserved and unproblematic. The description of the end of the procedure, although not so well preserved, is also relatively certain. The manuscript has:

tataḥ paścād gaṇayitavya [/] asmin āvāse iyadbhir bhikṣubhiḥ . . .
(with between eighteen and twenty syllables being lost).[19]

After that they must be counted. In this place of residence by so many monks . . .

Dutt reconstructs the end of the second sentence and prints the whole as:

tataḥ paścād gaṇayitavyāḥ / asminn āvāse iyadbhir bhikṣubhiḥ [śīlākā gṛhīteti /][20]

After that they must be counted [saying] "In this place of residence counting sticks have been taken by so many monks."

Apart from the fact that he here, and throughout, has printed *śilākā* for *śalākā* (and thereby, it seems, created a ghost form[21]), and apart from the absence of some form of a verb of speaking, this corresponds reasonably well with what is found in the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu* – this, of course, is hardly surprizing since this Tibetan translation is undoubtedly the source of his reconstruction:

de'i 'og tu bgrangs te gnas 'dir dge slong 'di snyed cig gis tshul shing blangs so zhes smros shig/[22]

After that, having been counted, he must say: "In this place of residence counting sticks have been taken by so many monks."

More importantly, however, that Dutt's reconstruction here is a reasonably good approximation is in fact confirmed by an independent Sanskrit source.

In digesting our passage from the *Varṣāvastu* Guṇaprabha in his *Vinayasūtra*, a text which Dutt did not know, gives the entire announcement:

gaṇayitvā pravedanam iyadbhir bhikṣubhir asminn āvāse śalākā gṛhīteti / (bgrangs nas gnas 'dir dge slong 'di snyed kyis tshul shing blangs so zhes go bar bya'o /)[23]

Having counted [the sticks, there must be] an announcement: "In this place of residence counting sticks have been taken by so many monks."

The meta-language of Guṇaprabha requires here that an imperative be understood, and the Tibetan translators have made it explicit. The Tibetan translators of our *Varṣāvastu* passage also clearly read an imperative verb of speaking there, and although it could also have been a future passive participle, a verb of speaking with an imperative force was almost certainly there. But apart from this omission Dutt's reconstruction of the text, then, can be taken to be relatively certain here. The case, for the moment, for what comes between the opening declaration and the closing announcement is, however, otherwise.

Between the opening declaration of our passage and its concluding announcement the text gives instructions on the order in which different individuals and groups must take a stick, or have one taken for them. And here we strike problems of at least two kinds: the problem of a damaged text and its reconstruction; and the problem of a faulty exemplar. The first type comes first.

Immediately after the description of the full opening declaration the text in the manuscript reads:

tataḥ paścāt śayanāsanagrāhakeṇa bhikṣuṇā śalākāś cāra . . .
. . . then about eighteen syllables have been lost.[24]

Parallels and the Tibetan translation make it virtually certain that *cāra* . . . can be reconstructed – as Dutt has done – to *cāra[yitavyāḥ]*, and that the whole can be translated as:

After that the monk who is Holder-of-Bedding-and-Seats must carry around the counting sticks.

So far so good. "The monk who is Holder-of-Bedding-and-Seats" is the monk in charge of the whole procedure, and *cārayati (brim par byed pa)* here is a technical term for the activity of taking around the counting sticks in "a little box" so that those who wish can take one.[25] But to reconstruct *cāra* . . . to *cāra[yitavyāḥ]* only accounts for three of the missing syllables, and the Tibetan translation indicates that an entire sentence has been lost. Here, of course, is where the trouble starts. The Tibetan translation reads:

je thog mar ston pa'i tshul shing blang bar bya'o /[26]

which Dutt reconstructs, or translates back into Sanskrit as:

ādau deśakena śilākā grahītavyāḥ /

and this is not a wholly inappropriate translation, which itself could be translated into English as:

First a counting stick must be taken by the *deśaka*.

The one grammatical problem with Dutt's reconstruction, or retranslation back into Sanskrit, is that – according to the Tibetan itself – what he gives as *deśaka* should not be in the instrumental, but rather in the genitive or dative: "of or for the *deśaka*." And this will be fully confirmed in what follows here. Equally problematic, however, is his *deśaka*.

Tibetan *ston pa* as a substantive means most commonly "teacher," so *deśaka* is not an impossible translation. But *deśaka* – without some qualification (e.g., *dharma-deśaka*) – probably occurs nowhere else in this *Vinaya* as a title or the name of a category of monk, and that is what we should have here. Moreover, there is a much more 'natural' Sanskrit equivalent for *ston pa*, and even Jäschke's entry under *ston pa* points to what that would be, and to who is being referred to here. Jäschke says, with succinctness: "The *ston pa* par excellence is Buddha, fr[e]q[uent],"[27] and there can be no real doubt that it is indeed the Buddha himself who is referred to in our *Varṣāvastu* passage.

First of all it is virtually certain that the *ston pa* in the Tibetan translation of our passage was not translating *deśaka*, but rather some

form – almost certainly genitive – of *Śāstṛ*. This is again confirmed by an independent Sanskrit source. The sentence that has been lost in the Gilgit manuscript appears in Guṇaprabha's digest of our passage in his *Vinayasūtra* as:

śāstur agre grahaṇam /
dang por ston pa'i blang ngo /[28]

Keeping in mind again that in Guṇaprabha's *sūtras* which give injunctions an imperative or future passive participle is always understood, we have

First [there must be] the taking [of a counting stick] for the Teacher.

Here, then, in an extant Sanskrit paraphrase of our passage the title is *Śāstṛ*, and the case genitive, the latter so translated in the Tibetan. Given that this is almost exactly what the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu* also seems to have been translating, both the shape and substance of the sentence that was lost from the Gilgit exemplar is all but certain. Neither, however, is very well represented in Dutt's reconstruction, and although warned, perhaps, by the brackets, the reader who is unprepared to deal with "textual problems," or unaware of what they might involve, or even just the hurried reader, might simply glide over this – I did. More than once – and a great deal would be lost. A good part of the loss turns, of course, on the fact that the original or 'correct' reading of the title in our passage was *Śāstṛ*, and there can be very little doubt about who the reader of this *Vinaya* would have thought this title referred to.

Every monk, it seems, had at least one "teacher" or *ācārya*, and one *upādhyāya* or "preceptor," but in all of this enormous *Vinaya* it appears that there could have been only one *Śāstṛ*.[29] Who that was, moreover, would have been perfectly clear. References to the *Śāstṛ*, or "the Teacher" – and both the definite article and the capitalization are, as will be seen, fully justified – occur in narrative contexts, liturgical contexts, in set phrases, and a variety of other settings. An instance of the first type might be cited, for example, from the *Cīvaravastu*. There we find a long account of how the Buddha himself comes upon an impoverished, sick, and neglected monk laying in his own filth. The Buddha cleans him up, nurses him, and shares his alms with him. The impoverished monk does not recognize the Buddha, and later the Buddha himself instructs Ānanda to inform him of who it was who had looked after him. Ānanda is explicitly instructed to say to the monk: *śāstrā te āyuṣman svayam evopasthānaṃ kṛtam (tshe dang ldan pa khyod kyi rim gro ston pa nyid kyis mdzad de)*, "You, Venerable One, have been nursed by just the Teacher himself."[30] Yet

another interesting narrative instance, an instance in which *Śāstṛ* is used interchangeably with several other epithets carried only by the Buddha, occurs in the *Uttaragrantha*. Here the text opens by saying "At that time the Blessed One (*bcom ldan 'das*) said to the monks: 'Monks, from time to time patrons and donors should in three ways fully gratify, worship, and please the gods who accept offerings.' " The three ways are then enumerated, and then the text says: "When the Blessed One (*bcom ldan 'das*) had said these words, when the Sugata (*bde bar gshegs pa*) had said these words, the Teacher (*ston pa*) said further ... ," and a set of three verses of *buddhavacana* then follow which are also now found in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, and in which *Śāstṛ* and Buddha are again used interchangeably.[31]

Of *Śāstṛ* in set phrases two examples might suffice. The first occurs three times, for example, in the *Śayanāsanavastu*. In all three cases when a monk or group of monks wants to criticize another monk or group of monks for not following what they think is the letter of the monastic law they say some form of: *katham idānīṃ yūyam āyuṣmantaḥ sthitasya eva śāstuḥ śāsanam antardhāpayatha (tshe dang ldan pa dag khyed da ltar ston pa nyid bzhugs bzhin du bstan pa nub par byed dam ci /). Yady asti vo kaukṛtyam ...* (with the action they want in the imperative), "How now must you destroy the religion when the *Śāstṛ* is still present! If you have any shame you must ..."[32] And yet another such set phrase also occurs in the *Śayanāsanavastu*. When a junior monk who is sick is thrown out of a cell by a more senior monk who claims it brahmins and householders criticize the monks, saying: *yūyaṃ pravrajitāḥ kāruṇikaś ca yuṣmākaṃ śāstā tat kathaṃ glānaṃ niṣkāsayatha (khyed cag rab tu byung la ston pa yang thugs rje can yin na / de ji ltar nad pa phyir 'byin par byed ces ...)*, "You are renouncers, and your *Śāstṛ* is compassionate – how is it that you evict someone who is sick?"[33] This same phrase, however, is more commonly used in cases where a layman, or especially a physician, recommends some practice to a monk, or group of monks, which would relieve or ameliorate some discomfort or suffering the monk is experiencing. The monk in question stereotypically responds by saying that the Buddha has not authorized such a practice (*nānujñātaṃ bhagavatā*), to which the laymen respond in turn by saying: *kāruṇiko vaḥ śāstā sthānam etad vidyate yad anujñāsyati*: "Your *Śāstṛ* is compassionate – given the situation he will authorize it."[34] In such cases – and they are numerous – *Bhagavan*, "the Blessed One," and *Śāstṛ*, "the Teacher," are used interchangeably almost in the same breath. And this is not the only kind of interchangeability that occurs in this formula. This same

formula occurs in at least two variant forms in the same section of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya*. At one place we might find: "Noble One, since your *Śāstṛ* is compassionate, etc. (*'phags pa khyod kyi ston pa ni thugs rje can yin pas* . . .)," while in another – again in the same section – we might have: "Noble One, since the Blessed One is compassionate, etc. (*'phags pa bcom ldan 'das ni thugs rje can lags pas* . . .)."[35]

None of these occurrences of the title *Śāstṛ*, it seems, requires a complicated exegesis, and it seems virtually certain that any monk who had read much of this *Vinaya* would have immediately seen in them a reference to the Buddha himself. But this same monk-reader would also have been familiar with the application of the title *Śāstṛ* to "things" which we might not necessarily see as the Buddha. The most interesting of these "things," perhaps, is what in the 19th century would have been called an "idol," and now, probably, an "image." In the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, for example, the monks of Śrāvastī leave "the Image of the One who Sits in the Shade of the Jambu Tree" out in the rain.[36] This important image is identified in the commentaries of both Vinītadeva and Śīlapālita as, in effect, an image of 'Bodhisattva' Śākyamuni sitting in princely dress under the rose-apple tree at the time of 'the first meditation,'[37] and a considerable number of images of this type have already been identified in the Indian art-historical record, the most striking example, perhaps, from Sahri-Bahlol.[38] But not only is this image meant – according to the text – to be placed at "the seniors' end of the assembly" and therefore to quite literally take the place of the Buddha, but when devout laymen criticize the monks for leaving what we think is an image out in the rain they do so by declaring "Even the *Śāstṛ* is forsaken by you! (. . . *khyed kyis ston pa yang bor ro zhes*)." And when the image of the Buddha is carried in procession by the monks, and they order the musicians to play, they say – to cite a final example – "Sirs, you must do the *pūjā* for the *Śāstṛ*! (. . . *bzhin bzangs ston pa la mchod par byos shig ces; bhoḥ puruṣa śāstuḥ pūjām iti*, according to the *Vinayasūtra*)."[39] Passages of this last sort in which the title *Śāstṛ*, "the Teacher," is applied to, or refers to, what we think is an "image" may be particularly important for a full understanding of our text in the *Varṣāvastu*, and it is therefore important to note that however odd this usage may now appear to us it makes perfect 'cultural' sense in India. There is in fact good evidence that indicates that, in spite of some learned Mīmāṃsaka protestations to the contrary, images in India were conceptually classified with persons and were treated as such behaviorally, ritually, and legally.[40] There is equally good evidence that whereas we see all images of the same 'person' as representations

of one figure, images in India were seen as specific individuals who resided in a specific locality and were so named.[41] Gifts, for example, in 2nd century Mithouri were not given to "the Buddha," but to the specific Buddha who resided in the Saptaparṇṇa Monastery there ... *saptaparṇṇa-vihāre bhagavat-pitāmahasya samyaksaṃbuddhasya ... cha[traṃ pra]tiṣṭhāpayati*). In the so-called "Larger Leiden Plates" – to cite a later example – a village is again not given to "the Buddha," but "to the Buddha residing in the surpassingly beautiful Cūḷāmaṇivarmma Monastery" in Nāgapaṭṭinam (*atiramaṇīyañ cūḷāmaṇivarmma-vihāram adhivasate buddhāya*).[42] These Buddhas – like perhaps all cult Buddhas in India – were conceptually local: they lived in local monasteries. And our *Varṣāvastu* passage may well be an important piece of this conceptual world.

But if, then, it appears highly likely that the title *Śāstṛ* in our *Varṣāvastu* passage would have been almost immediately understood as a reference to the Buddha himself, and perhaps to his 'image,' by an Indian monk who was familiar with the passages cited above from his *Vinaya* – or others like them – this in large part is confirmed by the commentarial tradition. The commentarial traditon for the *Varṣāvastu* is, however, not direct, and this at least must be noted even if, in the end, it may be of limited consequences. There is in fact no surviving Indian commentary on this *vastu*. There are instead four Indian commentaries which have come down to us on the *Vinayasūtra*, and the *Vinayasūtra* contains a very full version of our passage which they all comment on.

Three of the four commentaries on the *Vinayasūtra* explicitly gloss the *Śāstṛ* or *ston pa* of our passages. Dharmamitra's *Ṭīkā* has:

dang por ston pa'i blang ngo zhes bya ba ni / tshul shing brim pa'i tshe dang po kho nar tshul shing 'drim par byed pas ston pa sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyi tshul shing de blang bar bya'o /[43]

In regard to [the words] "First [there must be] the taking [of a counting stick] for the Teacher" [the meaning is]: at the time when counting sticks are carried around, as the very first thing, the one who carries the counting sticks around must take the counting stick for the *Śāstṛ*, the Buddha, the Blessed One!

The *Vyākhyāna* attributed to Prajñākara has:

ston pa'i dang por blang zhes pa ni bcom ldan 'das kyi sku skal du tshul shing 'brim pas gcig long shig pa'o /[44]

In regard to [the words] "First [there must be] the taking [of a counting stick] for the Teacher" [the meaning is]: the one who carries the counting sticks around must take one for the share of the Blessed One!

And the *Vṛtti* which is ascribed – perhaps not correctly – to Guṇaprabha himself has:

thog mar ston pa'i blang / tshul shing brim pa ni thog mar sangs rgyas kyi tshul shing gcig gzhag / dgra bcom pa'i tshul shing skal pa gcig gzhag /[45]

"First [there must be] the taking [of a counting stick] for the Teacher" [means]: By the one who carries the counting sticks around, first (of all), a counting stick for the Buddha must be put aside. He must put aside a counting stick as one portion for the Arhat.

It is perhaps worth noting here in passing that these citations incidentally demonstrate the apparent fact – not yet recognized – that there are three Tibetan translations of the *Vinayasūtra*: the separate, independent translation, and two other translations embedded in the commentaries, one in the *Vyākhyāna* and one in the *Vṛtti*. These variant translations differ largely – as here – only in wording, but the variations can sometimes be more significant. Apart from this, however, the more important point for the task at hand is that these citations from the commentarial tradition support, confirm, and make explicit what could only be deduced from the use of the title *Śāstṛ* in the canonical *Vinaya*. Dharmamitra, Prajñākara, and perhaps Guṇaprabha himself, all have taken *Śāstṛ* in the *Vinayasūtra*, and therefore in our *Varṣāvastu* passage which it presents, as a reference to the Buddha himself. They gloss the title *Śāstṛ* with *buddha, bhagavan*, with *bhagavan* again, and then again with *buddha* and, possibly, *arhat* – it is not entirely sure whether the stick for the *arhat* refers to a second, separate stick and action, or whether reference to it is simply a restatement of the action which must be undertaken in regard to the first. This uncertainty, however, has little effect on the main point: all sources – canonical and commentarial – make it all but impossible to see in our *Varṣāvastu* anything other than an explicit rule that the Buddha himself must receive a counting stick at the beginning of every rain retreat in every Mūlasarvāstivādin monastery. But the mere fact that such a rule could be framed must of necessity also mean that those who framed it assumed it was possible, that they assumed that the Buddha himself would – in some sense or some form – be there. And this is probably the most important point of all.

In the end it probably also does not matter much in precisely what form the Buddha was thought to have been present – it was perhaps most likely to have been, after a certain period and as already intimated, as an 'image'. Certainly, as we have already seen, 'images' were already referred to as the *Śāstṛ* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and in these cases they were clearly intended to function as the Buddha himself – in one such case the image is explicitly said to sit at the seniors' end of the monastic assembly. Very much the same sort of thing is also referred to in the literature of other – and supposedly very different –

Buddhist monastic groups as well. Silk, for example, has recently cited a long passage from Buddhaghosa's *Papañcasūdanī* which describes a communal context in which an image of the Buddha sits quite literally at the head of a monastic assembly in order to receive donations made to him.[46] But the fact remains that there is no explicit reference to an image in any of the sources for the *Varṣāvastu* – the canonical text, the *Vinayasūtra*, or any of its commentaries – and there is also no specific reference to images in regard to other figures who appear to have been equally present at the commencement of the rain retreat, and to have remained members of the local monastic group for its duration.

* * *

The reference to *Śāstṛ*, and the rule requiring that the Buddha himself must receive a counting stick at the beginning of every rain retreat in Mūlasarvāstivādin monasteries, disappeared from our Sanskrit text of the *Varṣāvastu* as a result of physical damage to the actual manuscript. But this, of course, is not the only cause of the loss of text in manuscript transmission. Manuscripts – it is probably not necessary to say – are human products and therefore, it seems, necessarily imperfect. Scribes or copyists make mistakes – they garble syllables, forget to mark vowels, misread their exemplars; their eyes, if not their minds, wander, and sometimes they leave things out or drop a line. Instances of particularly the last sort are often hard to detect when only a single manuscript of a work survives or is available, as is the case with the Sanskrit text of the *Varṣāvastu*, and where just such a loss seems to have occurred.

After specifying how various categories of monks – from the Elder to the most junior – must take their sticks, our text says, in Dutt's edition:

śrāmaṇerānācāryopādhyāyaiḥ śilākā grāhayitavyāḥ / tataḥ paścād gaṇayitavyāḥ /[47]

Once the misreadings of the manuscript here are corrected – the manuscript has, correctly: *śrāmaṇerānām ācāryopādhyāyaiḥ śalākā*, etc.[48] – this can be translated:

For the novices a counting stick must be taken by (their) teachers and preceptors. After that they (all the counting sticks) must be counted!

This is a smooth text and appears to be unproblematic. It might therefore be at least unexpected to find that all other sources bearing on this *Varṣāvastu* passage point to the virtual certainty that an entire sentence – and thereby reference to an entire category of individuals who were to be considered members of the monastic group – has here dropped out of

the Gilgit exemplar. This, however, is exactly what the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu*, Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* and its commentaries, and Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha* would seem to indicate.

Between the reference to teachers and preceptors taking sticks for their novices, and the sentence in our passage that says that all the sticks must then be counted, the Tibetan translation has the following sentence:

de'i 'og tu gnas (b)srung rnams kyi yang blang bar bya'o /[49]

Since there is by the very nature of the case no Sanskrit text for this sentence it is not immediately certain what *gnas (b)srung* – the key term in the sentence – is translating, although it is clear enough that it refers to yet another category or group of individuals (it is plural) that are to receive a counting stick, and that these individuals are neither monks nor novices: all such individuals have already been treated in previous sentences. Normally, of course, in situations of this kind one would hope to have recourse to an attested equivalent or equivalents elsewhere, but for *gnas (b)srung* such attested equivalents are not easy to come by, and the precise sense, or referent of Tibetan *gnas (b)srung* is itself not immediately obvious.

Jäschke gives two meanings for *gnas bsrung*, the first of which – "earnest-money, pledge, security, ticket" – is certainly not involved here. For the second he gives, citing Schmidt, "guardian, or warden of a monastery."[50] The second meaning is, of course, possible, but it would seem to entail that the reference in our *Varṣāvastu* passage was to a category of humans. The entry in Das, however, suggests something very different. He gives the meaning "earnest-money," but only secondarily, cites Jäschke as his authority, and seems to limit this meaning to the West. His entry actually starts:

> *gnas bsrung* gen. a local god or spirit entrusted with the duty of guarding a holy place or sanctuary against an enemy, be he god or man ... *gnas srung po* an epithet of *rnam sras* or Vaiśravaṇa who is the guardian of all Buddhist sacred places.[51]

This definition suggests, as already noted, a very different referent for our rule in the *Varṣāvastu*, and it is therefore unfortunate that Das cites neither a source nor an authority for it. This disadvantage, however, is in large part compensated for by the fact that several other sources bearing on our rule also have something corresponding to the sentence found in the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu* but not in the Gilgit exemplar. The first of these is Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha*.

In the *Vinayasaṃgraha* of Viśeṣamitra the whole of our passage appears as:

de nas tshul shing brims te / thog mar ston pa'i phyir blangs la de'i 'og tu dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis stan las phyed 'phags te blangs nas yang dal gyis bzhag go / dge tshul rnams kyi slob dpon dang mkhan pos blang ngo / de nas gnyug mar gnas pa rnams kyi blang ngo / de'i 'og tu bgrangs la bsgrag par bya'o /[52]

Then counting sticks are carried around, and first, for the sake of the Teacher, one is taken; and after that, when the Elder-of-the-Community has risen halfway from his seat, and taken one, he is then to put it slowly aside. For novices one is to be taken by their teacher or preceptor. Then for the local residents one is to be taken. After that they are counted and it is to be announced.

Viśeṣamitra's rehandling here of the canonical *Varṣāvastu* passage is important in at least two ways. First, Viśeṣamitra's summary contains a clear correspondent to the sentence found in the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu* but not in the Gilgit exemplar, and so makes it difficult to quickly mark the Tibetan sentence a later addition to the *Varṣāvastu*. Indeed, if Viśeṣamitra lived in the 7th/8th century – and that is possible – he might well have been roughly contemporary with the Gilgit exemplar. This possibility joined with the probability that Viśeṣamitra was a Kashmiri and therefore was himself using a text of the *Varṣāvastu* known there would point, rather, to the likelihood that the scribe at Gilgit – also in 'Kashmir' then – had inadvertently dropped out the sentence.[53] Either that, or there were two variant versions of our text circulating at roughly the same time in the same general area – and that, of course, is by no means impossible.

Secondly, although Viśeṣamitra's text has a version of our sentence or rule, it uses an expression to designate the last category of individuals that receive a stick which differs from that found in the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu*, and thereby provides what we can probably assume is a variant translation of the missing Sanskrit term.[54] And although the Tibetan expression found in Viśeṣamitra – *gnyug mar gnas pa* – is itself not well defined in the dictionaries, still, it is easy enough to determine what it, and related terms, translate in our *Vinaya*. In the *Kośāmbakavastu*, for example, *gnyug ma pa* as an adjective applied to monks translates Sanskrit *naivāsika*, "resident," and, more importantly, in the *Poṣadhavastu naivāsika* – again as an adjective applied to monks – is dozens of times translated by *gnyug mar gnas pa* itself.[55] In fact *naivāsika* is almost certainly the original Sanskrit that we are looking for, even if it is being used in, perhaps, a sense not particularly well known.

Like Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha*, Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* also has a sentence corresponding to the one missing in the Gilgit exemplar, and since it is again probable that Guṇaprabha – like perhaps Viśeṣamitra – can be dated to roughly the same period as the Gilgit manuscript, if

not in his case considerably earlier,[56] it again seems difficult to explain the absence of our sentence from the Gilgit exemplar as anything other than a copyist's error: we now have three independent witnesses to testify that it should be there. For Guṇaprabha, moreover, there is a Sanskrit text, although not a perfect one.

The only edition of the full text of the *Vinayasūtra* in Sanskrit so far available is far from satisfactory, and its text is in very many places problematic or corrupt. Unfortunately, one of these places is right in the middle of our sentence. The latter reads in Sankrityayana's edition, immediately after *ācāryopādhyāyaiḥ śrāmaṇerāṇām*, "By [their] teachers and preceptors [one is to be taken] for novices:"

naivāsikānām asye(? syai)tadante [/][57]

Even assuming that *asye* was read correctly, it is still very unsure what it was intended for, and this holds in spite of the fact that in the Tibetan translation of the *Vinayasūtra* this sentence is seemingly straightforward:

mjug tu gnyug mar gnas pa rnams kyi de yang ngo /[58]

At the end that is also [to be done] for the *naivāsikas*.

Here *mjug tu*, "at the end, lastly," is almost certainly translating something like *etadante*, "ending with this, ending thus," and – very importantly – *gnyug mar gnas pa rnams kyi* can only be translating *naivāsikānām*. This leaves *de yang ngo* to render what in Sankrityayana's edition appears as *asye(?)*, and a simple solution here is not obvious, but it is also not required. For our purposes it is not absolutely necessary to restore the Sanskrit text. It is sufficient – again for our purposes – not only to have located another attested Sanskrit equivalent for *gnyug mar gnas pa* and, possibly, even for *gnas (b)srung*, but to have done so in what is a traditional rehandling of our very same passage. That equivalent is, again in Guṇaprabha, *naivāsika*. But finding the Sanskrit equivalent is not necessarily the lexical El Dorado it is sometimes naively thought to be.

Like Tibetan *gnas (b)srung* and *gnyug mar gnas pa*, the Sanskrit *naivāsika* is itself not entirely well defined. Monier-Williams, for example, gives "dwelling", but can only cite the lexicographers as its authority. He also cites Patañjali for *naivāsika* as a "(suffix) indicating a dwelling-place or abode." Apart from this he gives for the substantive or noun form only the feminine *naivāsikā* as a "deity dwelling (in a tree)," citing the *Divyāvadāna* – he is referring here to the "divine maiden" who is the *naivāsikā* in the tree which the Buddha's mother held on to in giving birth to him, and who the monk Upagupta summoned to appear

in her divine form before King Aśoka (*naivāsikā yā ihāśokavṛkṣe saṃbuddhadarśinī yā devakanyā /sākṣād asau darśayatu svadeham* . . .).[59] Although Monier-Williams is probably wrong in taking the term here as a substantive and giving it only in the feminine, this is – as we will see – an important usage, which Edgerton also cites without, perhaps, recognizing its significance. The latter in fact cites under *naivāsika* as an adjective both the *Divyāvadāna* passage, and the passage cited above from the *Kośāmbakavastu* where *gnyug ma pa* translates *naivāsika*, and gives for both simply the meaning "resident" – in the first applied to the "divine maiden," in the second to a monk. Edgerton's entry for *naivāsika* as a noun is both a little puzzling and productive of what might turn out to be the ultimate solution.

For *naivāsika* as a substantive Edgerton, depending heavily on an old note of Hoernle's, gives the definition "some sort of monster, *python* or the like."[60] But this is based on a single passage from the *Mahāvastu* where *naivāsika* is probably best taken as an adjective applied to a python (*ajagara*) – Hoernle calls it "an epithet of *ajagara*." Edgerton does, however, also cite two important passages where *naivāsika* occurs in lists of substantives. The first is from the Sanskrit fragment from "Eastern Turkestan" to which Hoernle's note was attached. Although the passage is fragmentary, it is still clear enough that *naivāsika* here is one of a series of – for the moment – 'things' that seek to do harm to persons: *sa cet kaścid upasaṃkramati vyāḍo vā yakṣo vā amanuṣyo vā naivāsiko vā avatāra-pre[kṣī]. . .*[61] "If something approaches seeking a point of attack, either a malicious beast or a *yakṣa* or a non-human or a *naivāsika* . . ." Apart, perhaps, from *vyāḍa*, which is also ill-defined, *naivāsika* is here grouped with "spirits," "spirits" which can be by turns malevolent or benign but are frequently the former. The second list that Edgerton cites is from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, is identical with the first, and here refers to those "things" which are not able to harm a *bodhisattva* who has reached a certain stage: . . . *na śaknuvanti* . . . *vyāḍā vā yakṣā vā amanuṣyā vā naivāsikā vā viheṭhāṃ kartum*, "malicious beasts or *yakṣas* or non-humans or *naivāsikas* are not able to do (him) harm."[62] In addition to confirming that *naivāsikas* are grouped with other kinds of potentially malevolent spirits, and that the term *naivāsika* as a noun therefore can and does refer to a category of such spirits, the list in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* is also important because there is a Tibetan translation of it which provides yet another instance of an attested equivalent for Tibetan *gnyug mar gnas pa*. The Sanskrit list is translated into Tibetan as *gdug pa 'am gnod sbyin nam / mi ma yin pa gnyug mar gnas pa rnams*, and although there appears to be an *'am*

(*vā*) missing after *mi ma yin pa*, there can be no doubt that *gnyug mar gnas pa* here too is translating *naivāsika*.[63]

All of what we have seen so far would seem to be building toward a series of observations. First, it appears to be extremely likely that an entire sentence has dropped out of our Sanskrit text of the *Varṣāvastu* from Gilgit. Three indirect but independent witnesses – the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu*, Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha*, and the *Vinayasūtra* of Guṇaprabha – all would seem to indicate this, and two of these witnesses are at least roughly contemporary with the Gilgit exemplar, one possibly even much earlier. Second, all three witnesses also would seem to indicate that the missing sentence carried the rule that yet another category of individuals, distinct from those already enumerated – the Buddha himself, monks, and novices – must also receive a counting stick at the beginning of every rain retreat. Third, and assuming for the moment that there was only one designation for this category, the collective designation of this group was rendered into Tibetan in at least two different ways. In the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu* we find *gnas (b)srung*, which the dictionaries define as either a "guardian or warden of a monastery" – presumably human – or as "a local god or spirit" who guards a "holy place." In all other sources we find *gnyug mar gnas pa*, which in Tibetan seems to mean primarily 'a resident or local inhabitant'. Fourth, the Sanskrit original that is translated by *gnyug mar gnas pa* in the *Vinayasūtra* was almost certainly *naivāsika*, and – by extension and this attested equivalence elsewhere – it is safe to assume that the Tibetan text of Viśeṣamitra was also translating *naivāsika*. Given the fact that Guṇaprabha, in digesting a canonical passage almost always reproduces the key lexical items in it, and given the fact that in digesting our passage from the canonical *Varṣāvastu* he uses the term *naivāsika*, it seems almost equally certain – in spite of the variant translation *gnas (b)srung* – that *naivāsika* was also the term used in the Sanskrit text of the canonical *Varṣāvastu*. Fifth, and finally, although the Sanskrit term is not yet well or fully defined, it is clear that as an adjective *naivāsika* is applied to potentially menacing things like pythons or spirits (*devakanyā*) inhabiting specific local trees, and as a substantive occurs in lists of, again, various kinds of 'spirits' such as *yakṣas* and *amanuṣyas*. Although not homogeneous, this material surely tilts toward seeing in *naivāsika* not a reference to a category of humans, but to a category of spirits, the original or autochthonous inhabitants of a place who continue to reside there or hover about, and are capable of being powerful protectors, or guardians, or even threats. This 'definition' would tie together most of the loose

lexical threads and work in almost all the known contexts. Still, it would be nice if there were some additional confirmation. Even this, however, would seem to be forthcoming.

As the Indian commentaries on the *Vinayasūtra* made explicit the referent of *Śāstṛ*, so in much the same way do they make explicit the referent of *naivāsika*. The *Svavyākhyāna* attributed to Guṇaprabha says:

mjug tu gnyug mar gnas pa rnams kyi de yang ngo zhes bya ba ni / 'phrog ma la sogs pa dag gi tshul shing brim la'o /[64]

In regard to [the words] "At the end that is also [to be done] for the *naivāsikas*" [the meaning is]: a counting stick is carried around for Hārītī, etc.

The *Ṭīkā* of Dharmamitra:

mjug tu gnyug mar gnas pa rnams kyi de yang ngo zhes bya ba ni / de ltar dge tshul rnams kyi tshul shing brim pa zin pa'i mjug tu gtsug lag khang gi srung ma gnyug mar gnas pa lha mo chen mo 'phrog ma la sogs pa dag gi tshul shing brim pa de yang bya'o /[65]

In regard to [the words] "At the end ... etc. ..." [the meaning is]: Thus, after the carrying around of counting sticks for novices is finished, the carrying around of counting sticks for the tutelaries of the monastery, the local spirits (*naivāsika*), Mahādevī, Hārītī, etc., must also be done.

Prajñākara's *Vyākhyāna*:

gzhi pa rnams kyi 'ang mjug tu'o zhes pa ni gtsug lag khang gi srung ma ha ri ti 'am pan ci ga la sogs pa'i tshul shing yang yang mjug du long shig pa'o /[66]

In regard to [the words] "For the *naivāsikas* [this] also [is to be done] at the end" [means] a counting stick at the end must also be taken individually for the tutelaries of the monastery, Hārītī or Pañcika, etc.

(It is again worth observing the significantly different translation of the *sūtra* of Guṇaprabha that appears here. Yet another translation will occur in the *Vṛtti*, to be cited next, and in both 'new' translations of *naivāsika* occur: in Prajñākara's text *naivāsika* is translated by *gzhi pa*, "resident," and this in fact is the equivalent for *naivāsika* registered in the *Mahāvyutpatti*; in the *Vṛtti* it will be rendered by *'khod pa*, which would mean very much the same. In Prajñākara, moreover, both Hārītī and Pañcika are transliterated, not translated.)

Finally, there is the *Vṛtti*, which, like the *Svavyākhyāna*, is attributed to Guṇaprabha himself:

'khod pa yang 'di bzhin te mtha' nas so / dge 'dun thams cad la tshul shing brims zin pa'i 'jug tu gtsug lag khang gi srung ma'i lha la tshul shing gcig bsngos te gzhag go /[67]

["]The *naivāsikas* also, likewise, at the end ["means:] after the carrying around of counting sticks for all the Community (*saṅgha*) is finished, a counting stick is to be assigned and set aside for the tutelary god of the monastery.

These four commentarial passages would seem to make several things more or less certain. Bearing in mind that Guṇaprabha's *Vinayasūtra* represented an authoritative digest of the canonical *Vinaya*, and that Dharmamitra and Prajñākara not only took it to be so but were themselves also thoroughly familiar with the canonical *Vinaya*, as their frequent quotations from it show, there can be very little doubt that the version of the *Varṣāvastu* that all three knew contained – unlike the Gilgit exemplar – the reference to *naivāsikas*. The canonical text that Viśeṣamitra knew almost certainly did as well. Guṇaprabha, Dharmamitra, Prajñākara and Viśeṣamitra all considered it a canonical rule that a counting stick or sticks must be taken for the *naivāsikas* in the ritual that signalled the undertaking of each rain retreat in every Mūlasarvāstivādin monastery. Moreover, in three of the four commentaries the term *naivāsika* is glossed first of all and most generally with the expression *gtsug lag khang gi srung ma*, which in Sanskrit might have been **vihāra-pāla*, "tutelary of the *vihāra*" – this, for Dharmamitra, Prajñākara and Guṇaprabha, is what *naivāsika* meant. It did not refer to a category of humans, but to a category of protective, eminently local spirits or divinities who inhabit each *vihāra*.[68] The *Vṛtti*'s gloss is the most succinct and the only one which explicitly refers to its *naivāsika* as singular and as a "god" (*deva*). In glossing *naivāsika* all the other commentaries cite in part – but only in part – specifically named individuals who belong, presumably in the case of the *Svavyākhyāna*, to the category of "tutelaries of the *vihāra*": Mahādevī once; Pañcika once; and Hārītī three times. The prominence of Hārītī here – for which there is also strong archeological and art historical evidence[69] – is particularly helpful because we know something of her character and her story, and what we know can, presumably, be generalized to her cohorts. Hārītī is variously described as a *yakṣiṇī*, a *rākṣasī* or a *bhūta-mātar*[70] – Péri's "Mère-de-démons." She was at least by her origin tale entirely local, as the term *naivāsika* itself would suggest all members of this category were.[71] Like the goddess Mahādevī, she was obviously female, and many of the *naivāsikas* might well have been, although gender is not otherwise marked in our examples. Mahādevī herself, moreover, may present us with another useful model for understanding the nature of *naivāsikas*: hers is a name applied to a wide range of predominantly local feminine deities who have sometimes been linked – with differing degrees of completion – to the 'great tradition,' and sometimes not.[72] But even when Hārītī and other specifically named individuals are listed by our commentaries, they are listed only as examples, and the category of *naivāsika/*vihāra-pāla* is explicitly marked as an open one.

Regardless of their different lists of specifically named individuals, three of the four commentaries add to the end "etc." or "and so forth" (... *la sogs pa, ādi*), allowing for virtually limitless and almost certainly local additions. This openendedness would seem to be one of the most consistent aspects of the category. Another is the emphasis on the narrowly local. Again, in three out of the four cases the tutelaries (*srung ma, pāla*) are explicitly said to be "tutelaries of *a/the* monastery" – there is nowhere any indication that they reside in more than one. Like the *kriyākāras* at the beginning, the inclusion of the *naivāsikas* at the end of our passage and rule would seem to mark the entire ritual as very much oriented towards the specifically local.[73]

* * *

Even without unpacking them it is still probably fair to characterize our passage from the *Varṣāvastu*, and the ritual it prescribes, as rich in implications and freighted with meanings. But it is also probably already obvious how much of both would have been undetectable, inaccessible, and even completely lost to a student of religion or historian who was not prepared to recognize textual problems, and to acknowledge that such problems were indeed theirs. Though again probably obvious, this loss becomes particularly stark when the translation of two different versions of our passage are put side by side. On the left is a translation of the passage in Dutt's edition, which was in effect 'reprinted' by Bagchi, and one or another are all too commonly the only thing used. On the right – where it most suitably belongs – is a translation of the Tibetan text of our passage. Although a reasonably good Sanskrit text could now be reconstructed on the basis of our discussion, it would be only that: 'reasonably good' and a reconstruction. It would necessarily have to involve some serious emendation and restoration, and would inevitably involve some contamination. Using the Tibetan translation avoids the need for all of this. There is, moreover, very little doubt that the Tibetan translation is an extremely close one and represents a Sanskrit text as it actually existed at a specific point in time not far removed – by Indian textual standards – from the date of the Gilgit exemplar, as the ancillary sources and the discussion of them has, perhaps, indicated. – Incidentally, even after all that has been said, the Sanskrit text in Dutt/Bagchi will still present the reader/translator with some problems. They will be dealt with – in so far as this is possible – in the notes, but here, alas, it will not be possible to avoid at least some suggested emendation and – since such emendation will necessarily make some reference to the Tibetan – at least some contamination.

Dutt/(Bagchi)	Tibetan
After that counting sticks must be carried around by the monk who is the Holder-of-Bedding-and-Seats.[74] First a counting stick must be taken by the Instructor (*deśaka*). After that by just the Elder-of-the-Community, having risen from his seat,[75] having taken a counting stick,[76] it must be carefully put aside. Just so (it must be done by all) up to the Junior-of-the-Community. For novices a counting stick must be taken by (their) teachers and preceptors.[77] After that they (i.e. the counting sticks) must be counted, saying, "In this place of residence so many monks have taken a counting stick."	After that counting sticks must be carried around by the monk who is the Provider-of-Bedding-and-Seats.[74] At the very first a counting stick must be taken for the Teacher (i.e. the Buddha himself). After that, by the Elder-of-the-Community, rising halfway from his seat, and taking a counting stick, it must be carefully put aside. (By all) up to the Juniors-of-the-Community it must also be done thus. For novices a counting stick must be taken by (their) teachers and preceptors. After that a counting stick must also be taken for the local spirits. After that, counting them, he must say: "In this place of residence so many monks have taken a counting stick."

Again, for the historian or student of religion who was interested in knowing how Buddhist monks thought about their communities this passage from the *Varṣāvastu* would be a very important one. It could not, of course, tell him how all Buddhist monks thought about their communities, nor how average monks did. It would, however, present him or her with a rare instance in which he or she could see how literate, elite monks who were in a position to write the rules, thought the community should be conceived and constituted, or wanted it to be. As with virtually all extant Indian Buddhist literature, it would be an elite voice that they heard, and that at least would be far better than a resounding silence. It is possible, moreover, that these rules might even have been followed in Mūlasarvāstivādin monasteries in India. If so, the historian or student of religion would have at hand the script for a performance meant to annually and publicly constitute and signal membership in the group, to display in effect who was in and who was not. A faulty script, a script that obscured or entirely omitted prominent players would be worse than no script at all. It would – like the Dutt/(Bagchi) text does – conceal the fact that already in the early centuries of the Common Era some elite monks or *Vinaya* specialists conceived of the Buddha both as a living force and a local presence, or wanted him to be so conceived. Here, of course, it is hard to imagine that monks who framed the performance scripted in our passage, or monks who annually acted it out and lived in a world structured by it, would have been unduly troubled by, or even aware of, 'the problem of the absence of the Buddha,' and the notion that this 'problem' was an agent of change in the development of Buddhist practices and doctrines in India may have to be seriously modified, if not entirely abandoned.

Here too we also seem to have in our passage a simple, almost elegant, solution to *our* problem of how that 'living force and local presence' might have been *felt* – it was not likely to have been 'understood.'

No one, probably (and unless unduly perverse), would have serious difficulties with the suggestion that the monks who wrote our rules – elite monks – and the monks who annually acted them out, had few if any doubts that *naivāsikas*, or local spirits, or tutelaries, or Mahādevī, or Hārātī, were as real as rocks. All indications are that Buddhist monks in India lived in a world where such 'things' were simply there. Several rules in the *Vinayas* dealing with legitimate causes for breaking the rain retreat, for example, are entirely based on the assumption that *bhūtas, amanuṣyas*, etc., are real, hanging around, and capable of considerable mischief.[78] There are no signs of ontological unease. But the fact that – although placed at opposite ends of the performance – both the *Śāstṛ* and the *naivāsika* were ritually approached, and ritually included, in the same way might well imply that the easy familiarity in regard to one applied, in fact, to both. Inchoate, perhaps, but not discomfiting. And this is not to say that such 'conceptions' did not sometimes fall into the hands of the scholastically gifted – they almost certainly played a part, or lay behind, or were woven into, the sometimes arcane and almost always abstract controversies about, for example, whether gifts to the Buddha did or did not produce great merit. And from here, of course, they got tangled up in the economics of Buddhist monasteries.[79]

But if all of this is largely lost in a faulty script, so too are other things. The student of religion or historian who might be interested in how Buddhist monastic communities interacted with their local religious environments in India would – if they relied on Dutt (or Bagchi) – have completely missed the fact that already in the early centuries of the Common Era Buddhist monks were framing rules and constructing rituals which in effect, if not in intention, enfolded into their communities a wide and explicitly open-ended range of local spirits or *naivāsikas: yakṣas, rakṣas, bhūtas, amanuṣyas*, etc.[80] This was effected in this instance by annually and publicly signalling that they – like every member of the Community – received a counting stick at the formal commencement of the rains.[81] This particular performance is, moreover, almost certainly of a piece with others: the rule in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* which required that a verse or verses be recited in the monastery every day for *its deva* – such *devas* do not appear to be more specifically identified, but were obviously and narrowly local;[82] or the rule requiring such a recitation for the *deva* of any well or water source that a monk used in his travels;[83] etc. All this too is

lost. But surely enough has already been said here. Apart from the specific details, the kinds of problems pointed out here are, after all, not new ones – they have been pointed out many times before, and unfortunately they will most certainly have to be again.[84] I would only add one important thing. The point here was most certainly not to denigrate Nalinaksha Dutt. His editions of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* texts from Gilgit, as well as his editions of the *sūtra* material found there, are faulty, sometimes grievously so – he did an enormous amount of work in a very short period of time, and he himself was undoubtedly aware of what had to come after. Without him, however, it is very likely that the Gilgit manuscripts would in many cases still be moldering away in New Delhi. He published most of them quickly and gave us a start. Students not just of the *Vinaya*, but of Buddhist Sanskrit literature as a whole, owe him a great deal indeed. Hence my dedication.

NOTES

[1] Although I use the word "manuscript" here and below, what is said about it is entirely based on the published facsimile; and all references are to it: R. Vira and L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)* Part 6 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 10(6)) (Delhi, 1974), fols. 732–39; 741–740; 743–42.

[2] See K. Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Suppl: Bd. 30) (Stuttgart, 1990) 28, under 3.2.2. Poṣadhavastu; H. Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins* (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13 (Reinbek, 1994) 43 n. 1.

[3] C. Vogel, 'On Editing Indian Codices Unici (with Special Reference to the Gilgit Manuscripts)', in *Indology in India and Germany – Problems of Information, Coordination and Cooperation*, ed. H. von Stietencron (Tübingen, 1981), 59–69.

[4] The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in fact refers to both monastic *kriyākāras* and secular *kriyākāras*. For a sampling of both see *Vinayavibhaṅga*, Derge Cha 85a.7; *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 17.2 (secular), 109.16; *Kośāmbakavastu*, GMs iii 2, 174.5; *Saṅghabhedavastu* (Gnoli) ii 50.28 (secular), 176.2 (secular), 204.6; *Pravāraṇāvastu*, GMs iii 4, 123.11; *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 29.10, 225.5 ff, 245.17, 282.9 (all secular); *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 72b.1, 212b.7, Da 174a.4; etc.

[5] For references for this and other extant examples see G. Schopen, 'The Suppression of Nuns and the Ritual Murder of their Special Dead in Two Buddhist Monastic Texts', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24 (1996), 589, n. 45.

[6] See Schopen, 'The Suppression of Nuns and the Ritual Murder of their Special Dead', 576.

[7] *Kośāmbakavastu*, GMs iii 2, 174.5.

[8] G. Schopen, 'Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices', in *Sūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Indica et Tibetica 35), ed. P. Harrison and G. Schopen (Swisttal-Odendorf, 1998), 173ff.

[9] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 256a.6ff.

[10] For the calendrical device see Schopen, 'Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries', 173–175 and n. 61 (add to the latter S. Singh and K. Minowa, 'A Critical Edition and Translation of Abhisamācārikā Nāma Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇakaḥ', *Buddhist Studies* 12 (1988), 86.32ff, for another description of the device in an Indian language). For a richly detailed study of the nature, uses, and historical role of *śalākās* see H. Durt, 'Chū', *Hōbōgirin, Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, cinquième fascicule (Tokyo/Paris, 1979), 431–456.

[11] GBMs vi 732.1 – In citing the manuscript/facsimile I have made no attempt to 'correct' or 'normalize' it. – cf. *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 77.32–78.1, where the Sanskrit text is rather fully represented.

[12] For Dutt's edition of the *Varṣāvastu* see GMs iii 4, 133–55 (the passage cited here is at 133.1) (Dutt's edition was taken over wholesale in the 'edition' of S. Bagchi, *Mūlasarvāstivādavinayavastu*, Vol. I (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, XVI) (Darbhanga, 1967), 140–153, with a minimum of acknowledgment; it has virtually no independent or text-critical value). – In the facsimile the o-*mātrā* on *-r-* is not perfectly clear, but the following *-ca-* is, and both the Tibetan and context put the intended reading beyond any strong doubt (see also the collocation *kṛyākāra ārocayitavya*, which occurs several lines later in the manuscript – GBMs vi 732.10; GMs iii 4, 135.6 – and *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 78.4 which has *vadayet*). Dutt's misreading here may have led him even further astray, and may account for the otherwise mysterious fact that in his summary of the *Varṣāvastu* (Introduction, xvi), he seems to have taken *kriyākāra* as a reference to, or title of, "the supervising monk."

[13] *Varṣāvastu*, Derge Ka 239a.1: *de'i 'og tu khrims su bca' ba dag brjod par bya ste / dge 'dun btsun pa rnams gsan du gsol / gnas 'dir khrims su bca' ba 'di dang 'di dag mchis kyis / tshe dang ldan pa khyed cag las gang khrims su bca' ba 'di dang 'dis dbyar gnas par dam bca' bar spro ba de ni tshul shing long shig /*

[14] What follows here is dependent on and paraphrases and quotes from F. Cygler, 'Règles, coutumiers et statuts (v^e^–xiii^e^ siècles). Brèves considérations historico-typologiques', in *La vie quotidienne des moines et chanoines réguliers au moyen age et temps modernes*, ed. M. Derwich (Wroclaw, 1995), 31–49; esp. 31; 34; 40.

[15] For a good example see the 'Jetavanārāma Sanskrit Inscription', in *Epigraphia Zeylanica* 1 (1912), 1–9, assigned to "early in the ninth century A.D."; for others see the references in N. Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas. Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft. Beiheft N) (München, 1971), 7, n. 13–18.

[16] See, for example, T. Ellingson, 'Tibetan Monastic Constitutions: the Bca'-yig', in *Reflections on Tibetan Culture. Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*, ed. L. Epstein and R. F. Sherburne (Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter, 1990), 204–229. Ellingson (207), says: "The name *bca'-yig* is a contraction of *dge-'dun-la 'khrims-su bca'-ba'i yi-ge*, 'a document (*yi-ge*) establishing (*bca'-ba'i*) law (*'khrims*) for the Buddhist Sangha (*dge-'dun*)." Although he discusses in general terms the relationship of *bca'-yig* and "the Vinaya," he does not note that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* – the only Vinaya preserved in Tibetan – itself refers to and contains *'khrims su bca' ba-s*, nor does he note that the latter is a well attested translation of *kriyākāra*. For a translation of "the first third" of one such *bca'-yig* written by Tsong kha pa – and therefore probably not the most representative – see J. I. Cabezón, 'The Regulations of a Monastery', in *The Religions of Tibet in Practice*, ed. D. S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton, 1997), 335–351.

[17] N. Dutt, *Bodhisattvabhumi [Being the XVth Section of Asangapada's Yogacarabhumi]* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VII) (Patna, 1966), 111.3, .15; 112.19; 121.7; 122.15, .22; etc. = U. Wogihara, *Bodhisattvabhūmi. A Statement of Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being Fifteenth Section of Yogācārabhūmi)* (Tokyo, 1930–1936),

162.5, .25; 164.17; 176.8; 178.3; .13; etc. = M. Tatz, *Asanga's Chapter on Ethics with the Commentary of Tsong-kha-pa, the Basic Path to Awakening, the Complete Bodhisattva* (Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 4) (Lewiston/Queenston, 1986), 67, 68, 69, 79, 81, etc.

[18] *Pāli Vinaya* i 8.35 = *Book of the Discipline* iv 13 (a group of non-Buddhist ascetics); i 39.25 = iv 52 (between two individual religious); i 153.6 = iv 202-03; i 283.7 = iv 400; i 309.22 = iv 443; ii 76.27 = v 100; ii 207.24 = v 292–93; ii 210.21 = v 295.96; iii 104.21 = i 180; iii 160.6 = i 275 (= ii 76.27 = v 100); iii 220.24 = ii 63–64 (secular); iii 230.1 = ii 83.

[19] GBMs vi 732.3.

[20] GMs iii 4, 133.12.

[21] Edgerton has a separate entry for *śilākā* but cites only attestations from Dutt's edition of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and no others; Durt ("Chū," 431) says "śilākā est attesté dans le Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin," but, to judge by the *Varṣāvastu* occurrences, *śilākā* never actually occurs in the manuscript itself, and although occurrences in other *vastus* will have to be checked, the form seems to represent only a consistent misreading on Dutt's part.

[22] *Varṣāvastu*, Derge Ka 239a.5.

[23] *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 78.10 = *'dul ba'i mdo*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 61b.4.

[24] GBMs vi 732.2.

[25] Edgerton (BHSD 228), for example, gives "hands out, distributes" for *cārayati*, and Tibetan *'brim pa* means much the same. But to translate *śalākāś cāra[yitavyāḥ]* here as "must distribute the counting sticks" would obscure the actual nature of the procedure and the obvious emphasis our passage puts on the act of 'taking,' and what such 'taking' signifies. The monk who is Holder-of-Bedding-and-Seats does not in fact hand the stick out. He carries them around the assembly in a box or on a tray allowing those who agree to abide by the *kriyākāra* to take one – "novices" have one taken for them; see Durt, "Chū," 435.

[26] *Varṣāvastu*, Derge Ka 239a.4.

[27] H. A. *Jäschke, A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London, 1881), 224.

[28] *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 78.8 = *'dul ba'i mdo*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 61b.3.

[29] This at least would seem to be the purport of a passage like that found at *Saṅghabhedavastu* (Gnoli) ii 203.7 = Derge Nga 249b.7, although the Sanskrit text here needs clarification, if not correction.

[30] *Cīvaravastu*, GMs, iii 2, 130.10 = Derge Ga 107a.6.

[31] *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 97b.4 – For the verses, delivered here as if for the first time, see E. Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1950 Nr.2) Teil II (Berlin, 1951), §6.12–14. The text in the *Uttaragrantha* represents a Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic exegesis or clarification of the intent and application of these verses and is, therefore, of considerable importance for understanding the monastic attitude towards non-Buddhist Indian 'gods' and their cults. I hope to treat the text in some detail in the near future.

[32] *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 34.8; 39.16; 48.21 = Derge Ga 210a.1; 213a.2; 217b.4.

[33] *Śayanāsanavastu* (Gnoli) 43.15 = Derge Ga 215a.3.

[34] *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 237.12.

[35] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 160b.3; Da 36b.1.

[36] *Vinayavibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 15b.1–.6.

[37] Vinītadeva, *Vinayavibhaṅgapadavyākhyāna*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Tshu 137a.6; Śīlapālita, *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Dzu 80b.7.

38 See D. Schlingloff, 'Die Meditation unter dem Jambu-Baum', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 31 (1987), 111–130, although several further important examples have since come to light or been identified: see A. M. Quagliotti, 'A Gandharan Bodhisattva with Sūrya on the Headdress and Related Problems', *Annali*, forthcoming.

39 *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 175b.7; *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 120.28.

40 H. von Stietencron, 'Orthodox Attitudes Towards Temple Service and Image Worship in Ancient India', *Central Asiatic Journal* 21 (1977), 126–138; D. L. Eck, *Darśan. Seeing the Divine Image in India*, 3rd edn. (New York, 1996).

41 For some of the complexities involved see M. D. Rabe, 'Royal Temple Dedications', in *Religions of India in Practice*, ed. D. S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton, 1995), 235–243; and for just one typical example see F. Kielhorn, 'Harsha Stone Inscription of the Chahamana Vigraharaja', *Epigraphia Indica* 2 (1894), 116–130, where the Śiva installed in the temple on a mountain named Harṣa is himself repeatedly called *Harṣadeva*, "the God on Mt. Harṣa" or, simply, "God on Mt. Harṣa."

42 For full references and some discussion see G. Schopen, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu, 1997), 260 and n. 10; 267 and n. 40.

43 Dharmamitra, *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Yu 131a.2.

44 Prajñākara, *Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Ru 182a.7.

45 Guṇaprabha, *Vinayasūtravṛtti*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Lu 228b.4.

46 J. A. Silk, '*Cui bono?* Or Follow the Money. Identifying the Sophist in a Pāli Commentary', to appear in a volume in honor of Professor Sodō Mori – Silk also cites a similar, though less detailed, passage from the *Samantapāsādikā* – see I. B. Horner, *Papañcasūdanī Majjhimanikāyatthakathā*, Vol. 5 (London, 1938), 73.8–.30; and J. Takakusu and M. Nagai, *Samantapāsādikā* (London, 1924–1947), 1142.34–1143.23.

47 *Varṣāvastu*, GMs iii 4, 133.11.

48 GBMs vi 732.3.

49 *Varṣāvastu*, Derge Ka 239a5, although I cite here the reading that occurs in *The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur* (Leh, 1979), Vol. 1, fol. 684.3 (= 'dul ba Ka 341b.3). Derge reads: *de'i 'og tu gnas srung rnams kyis yang blang bar bya'o*. The orthography *srung/bsrung* is uncertain, and I have marked it as such, but Derge *kyis* – as all the material which will be cited below will show - needs to be corrected to *kyi*.

50 Jäschke, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, 311, s.v. *gnas pa*.

51 S. C. Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Calcutta, 1902), 753, s.v. *gnas bsrung*.

52 Viśeṣamitra, *Vinayasaṃgraha*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Nu 170a.1.

53 On Viśeṣamitra see Lama Chimpa and A. Chattopadhyaya, *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India* (Simla, 1970), 259.

54 The degree to which Viśeṣamitra closely follows the canonical text and its language can be seen indirectly by comparing the Tibetan translation of his text with the Tibetan translation of the canonical *Varṣāvastu*: *de'i 'og tu gnas mal stobs pa'i dge slong gis tshul shing brim par bya ste / je thog mar ston pa'i tshul shing blang bar bya'o / de'i 'og tu dge 'dun gyi gnas brtan gyis stan gyi steng nas spags te / tshul shing blangs la dal gyis gzhag par bya ste / dge 'dun gsar bu rnams kyi bar du yang de bzhin du bya'o / dge tshul rnams kyi tshul shing ni slob dpon nam / mkhan pos blang bar bya'o / de'i 'og tu gnas srung rnams kyis* [rd: *kyi*] *yang blang bar bya'o / de'i 'og tu bgrangs te* ... (Derge Ka 239a.3 – for a translation and Dutt's text see below). The fact that Viśeṣamitra's text appears to omit the reference to the rest of the monks (*dge 'dun gsar bu rnams kyi bar du* ...) will, of course, need some explanation.

[55] *Kośāmbakavastu*, GMs iii 2, 173.3 = Derge Ga 125b.2; Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu*, 354.5 (§63.1ff) = Derge Ka 148b.4ff.

[56] On Guṇaprabha see G. Schopen, 'Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22 (1994), 63–64 and ns. 63–65.

[57] *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 78.7 – Sankrityayana actually prints the text here as: *naivāsikānām asye(? syai)tadante śanaiḥ sthāpanam /*, but the Tibetan and the commentaries indicate that in so doing he has combined what should be two separate *sūtras* into one. This same sort of erroneous division is also found elsewhere in his edition.

[58] *'dul ba'i mdo*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 61b.3.

[59] M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1899), 570 – E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, *The Divyāvadāna. A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge, 1886), 390.4 (verse).

[60] F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven, 1953), 313.

[61] A. F. R. Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan* (Oxford, 1916), 41.24 – Hoernle reads at the end only *avatāra-pre ////*, at which point the rest of the line is lost. But parallels (see Edgerton, *BHSD* 71 s.v. *avatāra*) make it highly likely that the text had had a form of the common compound *avatāra-prekṣin*.

[62] For the text see Dutt, *Bodhisattvabhumi* 13.10; cf. Wogihara, *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, 19.25 and n. 3.

[63] *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, sems tsam Wi 11b.2.

[64] Guṇaprabha, *Svavyākhyānābhidhāna-vinayasūtravṛtti*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Zu 94a.6 – Derge actually reads ... *la sogs pa dag gis*; I have emended to *gi*

[65] Dharmamitra, *Vinayasūtraṭīkā*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Yu 131a.5.

[66] Prajñākara. *Vinayasūtravyākhyāna*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Ru 182b.1.

[67] Guṇaprabha, *Vinayasūtravṛtti*, Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Lu 228b.6.

[68] The equivalence *gtsug lag khang gi srung ma* = **vihāra-pāla* appears to be unattested, and is, moreover, problematic. It, or a very similar Sanskrit compound, also seems sometimes to be used as the name or title of a monastic office – see G. Schopen, 'The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 19.1 (1996), 110 and n. 6; Schopen, 'Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001), 133 and n. 80; Schopen, 'Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries', 173; 175. When applied to a monastic office, however, it is rendered into Tibetan as either *gtsug lag khang dag yongs su skyong bar byed pa rnams*, in the plural, or *gtsug lag khang skyong*. But all of this is very tentative. Ironically, *naivāsika* too is repeatedly used as an adjective applied to monks, as has already been noted above.

[69] For just a sampling see S. Gaulier et al, *Iconography of Religions XIII, 14. Buddhism in Afghanistan and Central Asia*, Part II (Leiden, 1976), 39; Figs. 111–114; A. M. Quagliotti, 'An Inscribed Image of Hārītī in the Chandigarh Government Museum and Art Gallery', *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 6 (1999/2000), 51–60, especially her very rich notes. For what is probably the earliest epigraphical reference to Hārītī, see G. Fussman, 'Documents épigraphiques kouchans (III). L'inscription kharoṣṭhī de senavarma, roi d'oḍi: une nouvelle lecture', *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 71 (1982), 5 (10c); 8 (10c).

[70] So Edgerton, *BHSD*, 619.

[71] N. Péri, 'Hārītī la mère-de-démons', *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 17 (1917), 1–102 is still the best single source on Hārītī, but see also J. D. Dhirasekera, 'Hārītī and Pāñcika', in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, ed. O.

H. de A. Wijesekera (Colombo, 1976), 61–70. The version of her origin tale that occurs in the Tibetan translation of the *Kṣudrakavastu* now also needs to be taken into account – it does not have a number of significant details found in the Chinese material – see Derge Da 145a.4ff.

72 See, for convenience, C. Bautze-Picron, *Le culte de la grande déesse au bihar méridional du VII^e au XII^e siècle* (Napoli, 1992), and the sources cited there in the notes to the introduction; (see also 24–25 and notes for Hārītī). Also the papers in *Devī. Goddesses of India*, ed. J. S. Hawley and D. M. Wulff (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1996), esp. C. A. Humes, 'Vindhyavāsinī. Local Goddess Yet Great Goddess', 49–76.

73 Were it not for the fact that it raises unrelated but intractable problems, at least one other commentarial passage could have been cited along the way, or as an apt summary of what we have seen so far and as a good indication of the general currency of the lexical usage discussed here. The passage in question occurs in Śīlapālita's *Āgamakṣudrakavyākhyāna* and reads: *gtsug lag khang na gnyug mar gnas pa ni gnod sbyin la sogs pa'o* (Derge, bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Dzu 63b.1). Bearing in mind that *gnyug mar gnas pa* can now be taken as an attested equivalent of *naivāsika*, and bearing in mind that it is now certain that *naivāsika* can be and is used to refer to an openended category of protective local 'spirits,' this gloss would appear to be straightforward: "In regard to [the words] 'the *naivāsika*(s) in the *vihāra* [the meaning is:] *yakṣa*(s), etc." The problem here is that the canonical passage that Śīlapālita appears to be commenting on, and which he quotes, does not seem to occur in the translation of the canonical *Kṣudrakavastu* that we have. The passage in the canonical text which we have that seems to correspond to what Śīlapālita quotes actually reads: *rgyal byed kyi tshal na gnas pa'i mi ma yin pa* ... (Derge Tha 175b.4). *If* this passage does in fact correspond to the one glossed by Śīlapālita then it would once again seem that there are, in part, two Tibetan translations of the *Kṣudrakavastu*, the separate translation now found in the *'dul ba*, and one embedded in Śīlapālita (cf. pp. 369, 376 above on a similar situation in regard to the *Vinayasūtra*). Whether or not this is the best description of the situation, and if so how to best explain it, remain uncertain. Any good explanation, moreover, would in any case require taking a far greater number of such cases – and there are many – into account. This, of course, would require a separate study.

74 Where the Sanskrit consistently has *śayanāsanagrāhaka* as the title for this officer the Tibetan just as consistently has *gnas mal stobs pa*. It is, however, difficult to see how the latter can represent a literal or etymological translation of the former.

75 Dutt's *tataḥ paścāt saṃghasthavireṇaiva / āsanād utthāya śilākāgṛhyaiḥ śanaiḥ sthāpayitavyāḥ* does not immediately yield good sense; it also in part misrepresents, and in part masks what is found in the manuscript: *tataḥ paścāt saṃghasthavireṇārdham āsana xx śalākāgṛ(h)yaiś śanaiḥ sthāpayitavyāḥ* (GBMs vi 732.3). I cannot be sure of the two *akṣaras* following *āsana-* but the preceding *ardham* is reasonably clear and is represented not only in the Tibetan translation of the *Varṣāvastu*, but also in Viśeṣamitra's *Vinayasaṃgraha* (above p. 371) and in the *Vinayasūtra* (*ardhamuktenāsanena* – 78.8. The two uncertain *akṣaras* in the facsimile could also be read as *-muktā-* or *-muktvā*).

76 Dutt's *śilākāgṛhyaiḥ* is hardly translatable, although in this case it represents on the whole, what is in the manuscript (see n. 75). In light of the Tibetan translation – *tshul shing blangs la* (Derge Ka 239a.4) – one solution is to take *gṛ(h)yaiś* as a scribal error for *gṛhya*, influenced by anticipation, by the immediately following frozen form *śanaiḥ*. This would require emending *śalākā-* to *śalākām*, the accusative object of the gerund (on uncompounded gerunds in *-ya* see Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* §35.1, .9 (citing Renou for Classical Sanskrit) – he says *gṛhya* is the commonest of such forms). All this, however, remains tentative.

[77] As noted above (p. 370) the manuscript has, correctly: *śrāmaṇerāṇām ācāryopādhyāyaiḥ* for what in Dutt is misprinted as *śrāmaṇerāṇācāryopādhyāyaiḥ*

[78] See in the *Varṣāvastu* itself GMs iii 4, 149.4ff; 150.13ff; see also *Pravāraṇāvastu*, GMs iii 4, 120.5ff; 121.3 ff.

[79] For just one example of the scholastic controversies see A. Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule* (Paris, 1955), 185 and n. 9. The economic side of these issues is just now starting to be explored – see the paper by Silk referred to above in n. 46.

[80] How the scribal omission of the rule in regard to *naivāsikas* in the Gilgit exemplar would have affected local monastic practice is of course an interesting – if unanswerable – question. Parry, for example, cites the "story" of "the [ritual] manual which contained the misprint *muttra* (urine) for *suttra* (thread), and of the priest who directed the offering accordingly" (J. P. Parry, *Death in Banaras* (Cambridge, 1994), 193), which might give one pause for thought!

[81] Notice, however, that the *naivāsikas*, although ritually made members of the group, are not fully or explicitly monasticized. The fact that they receive a stick would seem to grant them the rights and privileges of any other member of the Community, but they are not thereby made monks, and this is undoubtedly related, in part, to the rule that only humans can be ordained. Notice too the careful wording of the final announcement: "In this place of residence so many monks have *taken* a counting stick." This is a wording that is nothing if not precise since the *naivāsikas* – like the Buddha and the novices – did not themselves take a stick, but had one taken for them.

[82] See Schopen, 'Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries', 164; 172ff.

[83] *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 197a.4–198b.2.

[84] A good part of the reason for this is that textual scholars themselves have failed to make clear to a larger audience the importance of what they do, how they go about it, and what is at stake. For a rare exception see A. Skilton, 'The Letter of the Law and the Lore of Letters: The Role of Textual Criticism in the Transmission of Buddhist Scriptures', *Contemporary Buddhism* 1 (2000), 9–34.

ABBREVIATIONS

BHSD = F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven, 1953).

Derge = *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition*, ed. A. W. Barber (Taipei, 1991) – all citations from the *bka' 'gyur* are from the 'dul ba section and give original volume letter – original folio number – and line number. All citations from the *bstan 'gyur* are marked as such and give section name – original volume letter – original folio number – and line numbers.

GBMs = *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)* (Śata-Piṭaka Series Vol. 10(6)), ed. R. Vira and L. Chandra (New Delhi, 1974) – all citations are to part 6, and folio numbers assigned to the facsimiles, not original folio numbers.

GMs iii = *Gilgit Manuscripts*, ed. N. Dutt, Vol. III, Pt. 1 (Srinagar, 1947); Pt. 2 (Srinagar, 1942); Pt. 3 (Srinagar: 1943); Pt. 4 (Calcutta, 1950) – cited by volume – part – page – and line numbers.

Pāli Vinaya = *The Vinaya Piṭakam*, ed. H. Oldenberg, Vols. I–V (London: 1879–83) – cited by volume – page – line.

Saṅghabhedavastu (Gnoli) = *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu* (Serie Orientale Roma 49.1 & 2), ed. R. Gnoli (Roma, 1977–1978), Parts I and II. Cited by part – page – line.
Śayanāsanavastu (Gnoli) = *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and Adhikaraṇavastu* (Serie Orientale Roma 50), ed. R. Gnoli (Roma, 1978) – cited by page – line.
Vinayasūtra (Sankrityayana) = *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha* (Singhi Jain Śāstra Śiksāpītha. Singhi Jain Series – 74) ed. R. Sankrityayana (Bombay: 1981) – cited by page – line.

East Asian Languages and Cultures
405 Hilgard Avenue/290 Royce
UCLA
Los Angeles CA 90095